

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 19, 2004, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Office Action and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present Amendment overcomes the objection to the title by making the title indicative of the claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Patel et al.*

In the present claimed invention, the server communicates with the provider over the second connection to retrieve the content to be accessed by the user without disclosing identifying information about the user to the provider. That is, the content goes from the provider to the user by way of the server.

The present claimed invention offers an advantage in terms of anonymity. To the provider, it appears as though the server, rather than the user, is retrieving the content.

In *Patel*, on the other hand, the server (certificate authority 202) provides an anonymous certificate to allow the user 200 and the vendor or content provider 206 to communicate. However, the certificate authority 202 does not perform the same function of retrieving content to be accessed by the user as recited in the present claims. Instead, the user 200 uses the anonymous certificate to open a communication channel with the vendor. Beyond providing the certificate, the certificate authority 202 does not participate in that communication channel and in particular performs no

function of retrieving content to be accessed.

Thus, the applied reference does not meet the claim limitations directed to the operation of the server and does not teach or suggest any such operation. In fact, the applied reference and the present claimed invention are directed to different problems. Accordingly, the present claimed invention is not anticipated.

While the above arguments suffice to show the patentability of claims 1-4 and 6-12, the Applicants respectfully submit the following independent reasons why certain ones of the dependent claims are not anticipated.

With regard to claim 2, the Office Action alleges that the cache memory 108 of the computer system 100 of the applied reference meets that limitation. However, as explained above, the computer system 100 of the applied reference does not participate in the retrieval of the content to be accessed. Thus, the content to be accessed never reaches the cache memory 108 and is consequently not stored therein. Instead, in the applied reference, the cache memory 108 merely stores data signals for execution by the processor 102. Accordingly, claim 2 is not anticipated.

With regard to claim 3, the applied reference neither teaches nor remotely suggests reformatting a link as called for in the claim. The Office Action cites paragraph [0034] of the reference for that teaching. However, that paragraph is silent on the subject, but merely indicates circumstances in which an anonymous certificate might be desired.

Similarly, with regard to claim 4, paragraph [0035] of the applied reference does not teach or suggest a modified link for accessing the further content through a server, but instead merely describes the generation of an anonymous certificate. Thus, claims 3 and 4 are not anticipated.

Regarding the account maintained for the user in the database in claim 6 and the account

maintained for the provider in the database in claim 7, the applied reference is silent on those matters. While paragraph [0034] of the applied reference mentions electronic funds transfer, the system taught in the applied reference does not teach or suggest that the database maintains accounts for doing so. Instead, the only involvement that the system of the applied reference has in the payment is to reveal the identity of a buyer in case of default. Thus, claims 6 and 7 are not anticipated.

Regarding the preset amount of content in claim 11, the Office Action cites paragraphs [0033]-[0034] of the applied reference. However, the Applicants do not see what those paragraphs have to do with a preset amount of content. Instead, those paragraphs concern restrictions on access by citizenship or permanent residence, age of majority, and ability to pay, all of which are entirely separate from a preset amount of content. Thus, claim 11 is not anticipated.

Finally, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Patel et al* in view of *Toader et al*. Since *Toader et al* does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of *Patel et al*, the combination of references proposed in the Office Action would not have resulted in or otherwise rendered obvious the subject matter of claim 5.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance is earnestly solicited.

If there remain any issues that can be overcome most easily through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Please charge any deficiency in fees, or credit any overpayment thereof, to BLANK ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (109246.00103). If an extension of time is required to render this Amendment timely and either is not filed concurrently herewith or is insufficient to render this

Amendment timely, the Applicants hereby petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for such an extension for as many months as are required to render this Amendment timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary KEORKUNIAN et al

By:

David J. Edmondson

Reg. No. 35,126

BLANK ROME LLP
600 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20037-2485
(202) 772-5838 (Telephone)
(202) 572-1438 (Facsimile)